

Application No: 10/724,711
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3101

Amendment to the Drawings

The attached replacement sheets makes changes to Figs. 2A, 2B and 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

MAR 27 2007

Application No: 10/724,711
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3101REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent. Claims 6 and 7 are amended. New claim 8 is added.

In paragraphs 2-8 on pages 2-3, the Office Action objects to the drawings for the specified reasons. Regarding the objection detailed in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Applicant interprets this objection to pertain to Message Type in Figure 2A. There is no Message Length in Figure 1. Likewise, Message Length in Figure 2A includes a reference character. Other than this clarification of the intention in paragraph 3, the drawings have been corrected as suggested in paragraphs 2-8 of the Office Action.

For at the least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings specified in paragraphs 2-8 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In paragraphs 9 and 10 on page 3, the Office Action objects to the Specification for the specified reasons. The Specification is amended as suggested in paragraphs 9 and 10, except as follows.

In paragraph 9b) the Office Action asserts that there is a reference to a non-existent figure (Figure 1A) in paragraph [0017] line 1. Applicant has examined both the Specification as filed and the published version of the application. Applicant is unable to find the reference mentioned in paragraph 9b) of the Office Action in either of these versions of the application. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to the Specification specified in paragraph 9b) on the grounds that it incorrect.

Application No: 10/724,711
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3101

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the objection in the Specification detailed in paragraph 9 and 10 on page 3 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In paragraph 11 on page 3, the Office Action objects to claims 1, 6 and 7 for the specified informalities. Regarding subparagraphs c), d) and f), claims 6 and 7 are hereby amended. Regarding the objections to claim 1 in subparagraphs a) and b), these objections are respectfully traversed on the grounds that they do not apply to claim 1 as currently pending. See, e.g., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0120115. Regarding the objection to claim 7 specified in subparagraph e), this objection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the deficiency alleged in claim 7 does not exist in claim 7 as currently pending. Id.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the objections to claims 1, 6 and 7 in paragraph 11 on page 3 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In section 12 on pages 4-6, the Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,643,267 to Karia et al. (hereinafter "Karia"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action correctly concedes that much of the subject matter recited in claim 1 is not disclosed by Karia. However, the Office Action repeatedly asserts that subject matter recited in claim 1 is inherent in Karia. For example, claim 1 recites three steps in a method. One of the three steps recited in claim 1 is the step of "modifying a parameter." The Office Action relies entirely on an inherency argument with respect to this step in the recited method.

Application No: 10/724,711
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3101

Applicant respectfully submits that the step of modifying a parameter as recited in claim 1 is not inherently disclosed by Karia. In fact, it is respectfully submitted that this deficiency in the rejection is evident even by the Office Action's own assertion regarding what is allegedly inherent. Specifically, "the use of ATM networks which by definition incorporate the reservation of resources in conjunction with a Modify Request message" in no way describes "modifying a parameter" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-8 are allowable based at least on their dependency from claim 1 for the reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter recited therein.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that rejection of claims 1-7 as allegedly being anticipated by Karia be withdrawn.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 27 2007

Application No: 10/724,711
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3101**CONCLUSION**

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Mark R. Woodall
Registration No.: 43,286

Date: March 27, 2007

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802